

35
SUPPLEMENT TO THE WEEK,
OCTOBER 25TH, 1895.


CANADA AND HER RELATIONS
TO THE EMPIRE.

BY

LIEUT.-COL. G. T. DENISON.

[REPRINTED FROM THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.]

TORONTO, CANADA:
THE WEEK PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED.
1895.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Ontario Council of University Libraries

CANADA AND HER RELATIONS TO THE EMPIRE.

THE British Empire has grown with great rapidity, and the relations between the Mother Country and the Colonies have been constantly changing. Canada is one of the oldest Colonies, and yet her history can only be said to fairly commence with the migration of the United Empire Loyalists at the close of the American Revolution in 1783. A little over one hundred years have elapsed, and how many changes have occurred! In 1784, the loyal exiles, who had lost everything by standing true to the Motherland, were practically wards of the State. Tools and other necessities had to be provided by the Imperial Government, and for a time the population was necessarily fed, or partly fed, by rations distributed by Imperial officers. The Provision Lists of this date are a most pathetic feature of our records, containing, as they do, the names of the very best and wealthiest classes of the old colonies—educated, refined, and law-abiding citizens, who had lost the savings of generations through their loyalty to the Empire.

After this period came the establishment of Upper Canada as a Province under the Act of 1791. This Act gave the people certain self-governing powers, but provided for an irresponsible executive. With the growth of population and means came the desire for responsible government, and for the fuller-control of local affairs. This came in 1840 with the Union of Upper and Lower Canada. In 1867, the Confederation of the Dominion was accomplished, and almost imperceptibly with the increased territory, population, and strength, Canada has acquired far greater powers. In a little over one hundred years she has developed from the condition of a wilderness, containing in its recesses a few thousand settlers governed by Crown officers, into a vast Dominion with an immense area, with 5,000,000 of

people, with the fifth largest mercantile marine in the world, with 15,320 miles of railway, with excellent postal and telegraphic communications, and with all the other requirements of modern civilization. Her voice is now heard sometimes in international questions where her interests are affected.

Canada is independently governed as far as relates to all local affairs; but in international matters, and sea defence, the Mother Country has retained the control in her own hands. As she gives us no representation, she has not asked us to contribute to diplomatic, consular, or naval expenses generally. This being the case, Canada is at present, in international affairs, entirely under the control of the Home Government. Her interests and future prospects might be seriously and permanently injured, or greatly benefited, by the action of the Foreign Office, in proportion as the officials in charge of affairs either misunderstood or thoroughly appreciated her position.

It is a matter, therefore, of most serious import to Canada, that the public mind in England should understand somewhat of Canadian feeling and Canadian interests. The great Empire built up by our fathers can only be held together by mutual confidence, by kindly feeling, by national pride, and by common interest. Misunderstandings must be avoided. Canada in the past has suffered great and irreparable injury by the want of knowledge among English statesmen and people of the condition of affairs on this continent.

Misunderstandings, negligence, ignorance, what Lord Charles Beresford describes as the "savage stupidity of the British Government of 1774-1776," led to the loss by the Empire of the thirteen Colonies. But it meant more to the loyal adherents to the Crown in those Colonies. It meant to about 100,000 of them exile and the loss of their possessions. It meant hardships, sufferings, privation, and want—

"Dear were their homes where they were born ;
Where slept their honoured dead,
And rich and wide
On every side
The fruitful acres spread ;
But dearer to their faithful hearts
Than home, or gold, or lands,
Were Britain's laws, and Britain's Crown,
And Britain's flag of long renown,
And grip of British hands."

So they went penniless to Canada, while Lord Shelburne and Benjamin Franklin, between them, arranged the treaty of peace. Then, at the outset, Canada suffered, and has suffered ever since, from the first misunderstanding. Franklin at once began to play upon the weakness of Lord Shelburne. He sent agents to London, and professed the greatest of friendliness. The United States were to be friendly forever to England; but, as a mark of good feeling, England was to give way in everything to the Americans. Canada then extended down the Ohio and up the Mississippi to the Lake of the Woods. There was no doubt on this point, and English troops held the most important posts. Franklin was anxious to get this immense territory, and played upon Lord Shelburne's desire for "reconciliation" and free trade with great astuteness.

Unfortunately our forefathers, the Loyalists of the Revolution, were then fugitives, without money or influence. Their interests were entirely ignored by Lord Shelburne, who believed that the bonus with which he was endowing the New Republic would create a lasting peace, and preserve not only the friendship of the United States, but freedom in their markets for English manufactures forever. In this belief the Empire lost a territory of most fertile land much larger than Germany.

The same misunderstanding of Lord Shelburne led him to sacrifice our interests by giving the United States certain rights over our fisheries. Franklin's remark, "You know that we shall bring the greatest part of the fish to Great Britain to pay for your manufactures," was too much for Lord Shelburne, and the Canadians from that day to this have suffered from his credulity.

The Loyalists were also sacrificed in this treaty, the provision that Congress would urge the States Legislatures to grant to them amnesty and redress being an empty pretence which led to nothing. Another result of the mistaken belief of English statesmen in the "friendliness" and good faith of the United States.

Thus, at the close of the war, with about 270,000 square miles of the best part of Canada given away to their enemies, with their fisheries opened to those who had wronged them, deprived of all their worldly effects, and driven from their homes, these true friends of England entered upon the almost hopeless task of re-establishing British power on this continent. They plunged into the

wilderness, and were lost to sight. They had no roads, no towns, no villages, no shops, no newspapers, no printing presses, no means of recording their wrongs, save by tradition. Their history has been written by their enemies, and for a hundred years English writers have generally made it the fashion to ignore these brethren of their race, while their energies in writing on Transatlantic topics have been devoted to belauding the American Republic.

After many years of hardship to these Loyalists, the great struggle between England and Napoleon came on. England was fighting for her life against almost the whole of Europe, and then the first opportunity arrived for the United States to show their "friendliness." At once the feeling of hostility became manifest. The pretended cause of quarrel was one the Canadians had nothing to do with. The Orders in Council were passed by the English Government in the English interest alone, and on this pretext the United States declared war.

In Upper Canada a scant population of 70,000, with only 1,500 regular troops at the outset, faced the attacks of a country with a population of about 8,000,000, which, during the war, placed under arms no less than 86,000 regular troops, and 471,622 militia and volunteers, or a total of over 556,000. Once more in an English war the Loyalists and their sons had to fight for three years to uphold the British flag on this continent. Practically almost every able-bodied man in Canada was under arms. Our fields were laid waste, and many of our villages burned; but at Detroit, Queenston Heights, Stoney Creek, Lundy's Lane, Chrysler's Farm, Chateauguay, and other fields the Canadian militia and their British comrades faced as heavy odds and won as brilliant victories as are inscribed in the annals of our race. At the close of the war we were victorious. The enemy did not hold one inch of our territory, while their capital city had been captured by an English army, and the public buildings destroyed, in retaliation for the destruction of the public buildings of the capital of Upper Canada.

Mismanagement and the want of knowledge of Canadian affairs on the part of the Colonial Office, brought on the dissatisfaction which culminated in the so-called Rebellion of 1837, a paltry affair put down in a few days by the loyal Militia in Upper Canada, without the aid of a single British soldier, and with little or no loss. Then for nearly two years the whole of our Southern border was subjected to

inroads of filibusters from the United States, and many of our people were killed in defending the frontier. The Select Committee of the Legislature of Upper Canada reported to the House of Assembly in 1838 :

“The occupation and conquest of Texas in the South, and the assembling of an armed force on its eastern frontier, openly recruited in its principal cities and towns, commanded by its citizens, and by them also supplied with arms, ammunition, clothing, money and provisions, and transported in the presence of (if not encouraged by) its magistrates and public officers, in steamboats and other vessels into this province, and landed in it for the avowed purpose of overthrowing the Government, and wresting the Colony from the Crown of Great Britain, sufficiently proves that if the countries bordering on the United States desire to protect themselves from the inroads of freebooters, pirates, fugitive traitors and outlaws, they must look for security to their own fleets and armies, and not to the honourable forbearance of the American people, or the efficiency or moral influence of their Government.”

In 1842 the Maine boundary question became so strained that Lord Ashburton was sent out by the British Government to arrange a treaty. He was a weak, well-meaning man, who had been intimately associated with the United States by commercial and family relations. He knew little or nothing of Canada, and yet our interests were in his hands. Through his want of knowledge and weakness, the State of Maine cuts up into our territory like a dog's tooth, and stands a lasting monument of the sacrifice of Canadian rights. Daniel Webster, the American Commissioner, suppressed the evidence which was in his possession, showing our undoubted right to the disputed territory, and deliberately, in writing, expressed to Lord Ashburton his confidence in the validity of the American claim. This seems to have been enough for Lord Ashburton. After the treaty was agreed upon, the United States Senate demurred to ratifying it, and Mr. Webster allowed Senator Rives to lay before the Senate, in secret session, the proofs that an unfair treaty had been secured, and the Senate then ratified it, knowing it was obtained by dishonest methods.¹

¹ A very full account of this transaction will be found in *The Last Forty Years, or Canada since the Union in 1841*. By John Charles Dent, F.R.S.C. Published by George Virtue, Toronto. 1881. 2 vols. The

In 1854 Lord Elgin effected a reciprocity treaty with the United States, by which in return for the right of fishing in our waters, reciprocal free trade was permitted in certain articles between Canada and the States. This lasted twelve years, and as soon as our business relations had become closely interlaced, the treaty was summarily brought to an end. It was not that the treaty was disadvantageous to the United States, for the exports to Canada were greater than the imports from the Provinces. It was openly declared that it was abrogated in the hope that commercial disaster and financial ruin would drive us into annexation. This attempt failed. The loyalty of the race that had always stood by the Crown—a loyalty baptized in blood on many a hard-fought field—was not to be affected by sordid motives. The scattered provinces came together under the stress of foreign hostility, and Confederation was the outcome.

The next incident in American aggression was the Fenian movement of 1866. For years preparations had been going on in the States—a public organization was effected, a President and Senate appointed, and an Irish Republic without a territory, was formally proclaimed. The public offices of State of this so-called Republic were filled up, a large mansion in New York rented, and the Irish flag hoisted over it. The Secretary of the Treasury of the New Republic issued a large amount of bonds which were readily sold, and Fenian troops were organized, uniformed, armed and openly drilled in the towns and cities of the United

details will be found in pages 203 to 213 of the first volume. They show that Daniel Webster had in his possession a *facsimile* of a map showing the true boundary as settled in 1783, marked in red ink by Benjamin Franklin, the United States Commissioner. He suppressed this map and produced another map which gave to the United States a large portion of British territory. When the Senate afterwards in secret session demurred to ratifying it, Webster authorized Mr. Rives, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to produce the map which proved that he had secured a large area which did not belong to the United States, and then the Senate ratified it. This was on the 17th August, 1842, only eight days after the signing of the Ashburton Treaty. The Senate subsequently dissolved the injunction of secrecy and authorized the publication of Mr. Rives' speech. See Dent, vol. i., 209, 210, 211.

Dr. Kingsford, in his *History of Canada*, vol. vii., p. 159, speaking of this, says: "We came out of the negotiations serious losers; but no national reproach of meanness and wrong rises unbidden to wring our consciences. It is a question if a high-minded citizen of the United States can, with complacency, contemplate the proceedings of his Government on this occasion."

States. In May, 1866, these organized bodies moved openly upon Canada. The railways furnished special facilities for their transport to the border—about 30,000 men were altogether thrown upon our frontier, and large numbers crossed at several points. They were promptly driven out, and not until the movement had failed did the United States Government take any action to preserve their neutrality.

Le Caron describes an interview he and General O'Neill, the Fenian leader, had with President Johnson at the White House, when Johnson said to O'Neill :

" Now I want you to understand that my sympathies are entirely with you, and anything which lies in my power I am willing to do to assist you : but you must remember that I gave you five full days, before issuing any proclamation stopping you. What in God's name more did you want ? If you could not get there in five days, by God, you could never get there ; and then, as President, I was compelled to enforce the neutrality laws, or be denounced on every side."

These Fenian raids cost many valuable Canadian lives. Three honour men of our University, in the same volunteer company, were killed in action, fighting in the ranks as private soldiers. They cost us also millions of money, and a large loss in the disturbance of business. During the American Civil War, the Alabama escaped by accident, unarm'd, from a British port, and being afterwards fitted out as a war vessel, fought on behalf of the Confederate States, and did considerable damage to the United States mercantile marine. A claim was at once made by the United States Government upon the British Government for redress, and damages were demanded. After much negotiation, a High Joint Commission, to consider this and other questions, was appointed, and our Premier, Sir John Macdonald, was named as one of the five British Commissioners.

In his letters from Washington, Sir John Macdonald throws much light upon the inner history of the negotiations. In one of his earliest letters to his colleagues, he says :

" Having nearly made up my mind that the Americans want everything, and will give us nothing in exchange, one of my chief aims now is, to convince the British Commissioners of the unreasonableness of the Yankees. This they are beginning to find out, and are a good deal disappoint-

ed." On April 1, 1871, he writes, "I must say I am greatly disappointed at the course taken by the British Commissioners. They seem to have only one thing on their minds, that is, to go home to England with a treaty in their pockets, settling everything, no matter at what cost to Canada."

The treaty was bad enough. The United States succeeded in making the Arbitrators, appointed to fix the amount of the Alabama claims, believe that their citizens had suffered losses to the extent of \$15,000,000. This was promptly paid by England. The United States then paid all the losses, which amounted to about \$6,000,000, leaving about \$9,000,000 which they had secured for losses that were never sustained. This money is still in their Treasury.

Canada did not get her Fenian claims, which were founded upon the most flagrant breach of international law on the part of the United States. At the end of the term provided by the treaty the United States gave the necessary notice for the abrogation of the fishery clauses. Other attempts soon followed to embarrass us, and coerce or coax us into closer relations with the United States. Efforts to annex the West Indian Islands, or to make treaties with them discriminating against Canada and the Mother Country, failed.

Although the Washington Government had themselves abrogated the fishery clauses, and deprived us of the right we had under them of free entry for our fish in the American market, they still claimed the right to fish in our waters, which had been granted to them upon that condition. Our Canadian Government was firm, and prohibited the fishing. After much warlike talk, a temporary *modus vivendi* was granted to the Americans, and the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper were sent to negotiate a settlement. A treaty was agreed upon, but the United States Senate promptly repudiated the action of their Government, and refused to ratify it. President Cleveland, in his anger at the Senate, determined to punish somebody. Once more Canada was to be the scapegoat. He issued his famous Retaliation message of 1888, threatening all kinds of dire vengeance upon the Canadian people. The absolute injustice of this is proved by the President's own statement:

"I fully believe the treaty just rejected by the Senate

was well suited to the exigency, and that its provisions were adequate for our security in the future from vexatious incidents, and for the promotion of friendly neighbourhood and intimacy, without sacrificing in the least our national pride and dignity."

The McKinley Bill was the next manifestation of American "friendliness." It was aimed, of course, at all foreign countries, but as against Canada it was especially severe, in fact almost prohibitive. The import statistics were carefully studied, and on all that Canada sold exceptionally heavy increases were made in the tariff. Barley, eggs, horses and cattle were taxed, so as to almost totally destroy Canadian trade in those products; the belief in the States was that a prolonged dose of McKinleyism would bring Canada into the Union. The Canadians, who had seen their interests constantly sacrificed to propitiate American friendship, now saw nearly one-half of their export trade practically cut off, because they would not agree to discriminate against England. They did not falter, however, or waver in their allegiance. They turned their attention to other markets and their efforts to other lines of production. What would you in England think if a coalition of enemies were suddenly to attempt to cut off half your export trade?

For a number of years Canadians from our Western coast have been engaged in seal hunting in the Pacific Ocean and in the Behring Sea. This gave another opportunity for American aggression upon Canadian rights. Our vessels flying the flag of our Empire were captured on the high seas, far from land, and their property forcibly taken from them by war vessels of the United States. Diplomatic remonstrances on the part of the British Government against these insults to her flag caused the United States to treat with our representatives for some friendly solution of the difficulty. An understanding was arrived at. This time it was not the Senate that broke off the negotiations, but the President, Mr. Harrison, who repudiated the action of his Secretary of State, and announced that he was sending war vessels to the Behring Seas, to renew the seizure of British vessels. Fortunately the then British Premier was a capable man, of Imperial instincts, and on June 14, 1890, the ultimatum of the British Government was presented:

"The undersigned is in consequence instructed formally to protest against such interference, and to declare that

Her Britannic Majesty's Government must hold the Government of the United States responsible for the consequences that may ensue from acts which are contrary to the established principles of international law."

This firm tone and the emphatic verbal statements which, it is said, were conveyed to the United States Government by the British Ambassador, followed, as they were, by large increases to the fleets on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, as well as by other preparations in Bermuda and the West Indies, had the same effect as Lord Palmerston's firmness in the Trent affair. No more vessels were seized, and arrangements were soon made for the arbitration which was held not long since in Paris.

Thanks to the kind feeling and liberality of the British Government, we were represented on the Board of Arbitration by our late Premier, Sir John Thompson.

A striking instance of the method of American negotiation has been given in the action of Daniel Webster on the Maine boundary, in concealing conclusive evidence and urging fraudulent claims, knowing them to be so. The Behring Sea negotiation is even still more unfortunate. The most important point in the United States contention was based upon the Russian despatches and papers of the year 1820. These papers were translated by order of the United States Government, and published in their formal statement of their case. In these translations were a large number of interpolations and errors so glaring, that, as the British counter case states, "some person had deliberately falsified the translations in a sense favourable to the contentions of the United States."¹ A large number of affidavits were also published. Upon investigation, the strangest and most unaccountable mistakes were found. One United States agent appeared as having signed affidavits on the same day at Victoria and San Francisco, 1000 miles apart. Another received attestations on the same day at Kodiak and San Francisco, 1680 miles apart.² Some persons alleged to have made affidavits swore positively

¹ *Behring Sea Arbitration*: Counter Case, presented by the British Government to the Tribunal of Arbitration. Presented to Parliament, March, 1893, pp. 4, 5.

² *Behring Sea Arbitration*. Argument of British Government to Tribunal. Presented to Parliament, March, 1893, pp. 148, 149, and references.

they did not do so.¹ The United States were obliged to withdraw all that part of their case, although they did not withdraw their claims based upon it.² The large sum awarded to our sealers for damages, and agreed to by the Washington Government, has not yet been paid by Congress, although it has been requested by the President to do so.

The want of knowledge of American and Canadian affairs in England is easily explained. The English people know absolutely nothing about the masses of the American people. Those Americans only who are possessed of considerable means travel in Europe. Those who have means are either the descendants of wealthy families who have inherited fortunes, or are energetic, industrious, and capable men who have been successful in business. The great masses of the people do not cross the Atlantic. Of those who do cross, those who are friendly to England go there, while the greater portion practically avoid it, and travel upon the Continent. Of those visiting England, only the best, as a rule, get an introduction into English society; and from these, the choicest of the American better classes, the English form their opinion of the people of the United States. They do not know that this class is out of sympathy with the masses of their fellow-countrymen, and are despised and disliked at home for their friendliness to England. In fact, the distinctive term "Anglomaniac" has been given to the type. The ordinary American dislikes and despises an Anglomaniac about as much as a Russian official would dislike a Nihilist, or a French shopkeeper an Anarchist. Those Anglomaniacs, who are really the best people in the United States, no doubt feel friendly to England, and they find it much more pleasant and polite to tell their English friends of the kindly feeling they bear to England, than to dilate upon the hostility of the masses of their fellow-countrymen. The British people should understand, however, that this class has about as much influence upon American politics as the foreign lodgers in the neighbourhood of Leicester Square have upon the politics or public opinion of England.

This erroneous idea of American "friendliness," and the indifference of the English people to the interests of

¹ *British Counter Case*, above referred to, p. 198. See also Appendix, vol. ii. pp. 140, 165.

² *British Counter Case*, p. 5.

their own Empire on this Continent, have sent an immense amount of capital, and an enormous emigration, to develop and strengthen a foreign country, while Canada, in comparison, has been neglected, and has always been obliged to fight an uphill fight alongside of her powerful rival. When a distinguished English author wishes to establish a colony for young Englishmen, he does not choose a spot in Canada, Australia, or South Africa, where these young men could live under their own flag, and retain their allegiance, but he chooses a place among the hills of Tennessee, under an alien flag and alien institutions.

The English press is often used for attacks upon Canada. A remarkable instance of this appeared in the *Contemporary Review* of last January, from the pen of Mr. Goldwin Smith, in an article on the Ottawa Conference. He says very little about the Conference, but devotes the greater part of the article to harsh criticism of Canada and Canadian interests in general. There are many inaccuracies and unfair conclusions, and the whole tone of the article is so hostile to Canada as to have an injurious effect upon the minds of those Englishmen whose knowledge of Canada is derived from reading instead of from personal observation.

It is hardly necessary to refer to the sneering tone in which the Conference is dealt with, or to the extraordinary objection that the delegates "were accredited, not by the Legislatures, or by the people of the Colonies at large, but only by the Governments." This is on a par with the second objection, viz., that the Conference dealt with the questions they had been called together to discuss, and omitted to discuss other subjects that Mr. Smith thought they should have dealt with. Because they did not consider the question of defence, he concludes, "Morally speaking, we may take it as pretty well settled, that the Colonies will not contribute to the defence of the Empire," and yet in a postscript to the same article he refers to a subsequent offer of assistance to England in case of war, from the Canadian Government, of their permanent force, and only does so, to sneer at the fact that the force is not a large one.

He says, "A body of French Militia was despatched with the military of British Canada to put down the French half-breed rebellion; but it was not sent to the front, and both the colonels being politicians, retired from the theatre of war." This statement is not true. Two regiments of

French Canadians went to the North-West. One colonel at the very outset was obliged to return to Ottawa for several reasons, the most important being severe illness. He left with the approval of General Strange, commanding. On reaching Ottawa, finding that his absence occasioned comment, although very ill, suffering from internal hemorrhage, he returned and served through the campaign. The other colonel served through the whole affair. As to the statement that they were not sent to the front, Mr. Smith should have known that a French Canadian Militia regiment was engaged and suffered losses in the fight at Frenchman's Butte, the furthest point where there was fighting. Canadians of English origin, remembering the gallant services of the French in 1775, and in 1812-13-14, when they fought beside our fathers on the same fields, and under the same flag, deeply resent these unfounded sneers at our fellow-countrymen. General Strange, who commanded the column, says : —

"The 65th, who had borne the brunt of the marching for 500 miles, having been in the first advance, had tramped the soles off their boots, some were literally barefoot, others with muddy, blood-stained rags tied around their feet." And yet Goldwin Smith says, "No French regiment went to the front."

Again Mr. Smith says, "Great Britain then has fair notice that the burden of Imperial defence, especially the naval part of it, is to be borne by her alone." Who gave her this notice? Are Mr. Smith's statements about the French to be construed as an intimation to Great Britain? Great Britain has had no such notice, for the fact of the Conference dealing with the special subjects they were called to discuss is no proof of what they might have done on other questions.

Great Britain knows that in 1776, in 1812, in the Fenian troubles, all of which were Imperial quarrels, the "burden of Imperial defence" was not "borne by her alone." In the Trent affair, certainly an Imperial, not a Canadian quarrel, what happened? Every man in Canada willing to fight—people drilling in every town and village, business seriously affected, but no man complaining that it was an English quarrel. The flag of our fathers had been insulted, and our British blood was roused as yours was, and no one thought of the cost.

We are contributing towards the construction and

guarding of the Naval Station at Esquimalt, and yet Mr. Goldwin Smith says Great Britain has fair notice that we will do nothing.

The fact of the Canadian Pacific Railway being of any service to the Empire is a very sore subject with Mr. Smith, and his attacks upon it tend very much to mislead the English mind upon the subject. We will hardly take him as the highest authority upon what is the best line of Military and Naval communication, but he says: "It is assumed that the Canadian Pacific Railway, which forms the means of transit, is entirely within British territory and therefore perfectly secure," and then he proceeds as follows: "The Canadian Pacific Railway is not entirely within territory even nominally British. It passes through the State of Maine," etc.

In speaking of the transit across the Continent, as an alternative route to the East, the main line of the Canadian Pacific is always referred to, and of the main line, which runs from Quebec to Vancouver, every mile is on Canadian territory. The road has a connection, by the Montreal and Atlantic, with the New England railways, and the "short line" branch runs through the State of Maine. It also controls two railways in the Western States as feeders to its system, but is it fair to place such a misleading statement before the British public? In summer, Quebec would always be used to tranship, in winter Halifax would be used, and the Intercolonial which meets the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec. We have complete transcontinental railway communication, both in winter and summer, within our own territory, from our seaports on the Atlantic to our seaports on the Pacific, and Mr. Goldwin Smith knows this as well as does any Canadian.

He talks of snow-blocks, avalanches and floods. There was an exceptional flood, greater than ever before known, last spring, and traffic was suspended for a short time. A similar flood is not likely to occur again; even if it did, the alterations in the line, and other precautions which have since been taken, would guard against a recurrence of the difficulty. Several of the transcontinental lines suffered far more seriously. The road is also comparatively free from snow-blocks. Even in Great Britain railways are often blocked by snowstorms, as they have been this winter, yet it would be absurd to say that because snow-blocks had sometimes occurred, the English and Scotch railways would

not be of use for moving troops from one part of the country to the other, in case of threatened invasion.

Another remarkable statement is that, "left to themselves, the Americans have not the slightest inclination either to attack England or to aggress upon Canadian independence." This denial of American hostility to England and the Empire is curious, coming as it does from the writer of the article on "The Hatred of England" in the *North American Review* of May, 1890. In this article Mr. Smith, speaking of the Anglophobia among the Americans, says :

"It stands seriously in the way of any attempt to effect a re-union of the English-speaking race upon this Continent. British Canadians love a Mother Country which has never wilfully given them any cause for complaint, and they take hostility to her as hostility to them. . . ." Again he says : "It is too certain that there is a genuine as well as a factitious Anglophobia. . . The mass of the people are not well informed : they read the old story and imbibe the old hatred." Again : "The wound still bleeds in the popular histories which form the sentiments of the people. . . . A generation at least will probably pass before the popular version will conform itself to the scientific version, and before Americans, who read no annals but their own, will cease, historically at least, to identify patriotism with hostility to Great Britain. . . ." Again : "I could mention American authors whose writings would be charming to me if the taste of Anglophobia were not always coming, like the taste of garlic in Italian cookery, to offend the palate of the English reader. . . . Nor in the English press is there anything corresponding to the anti-British tone—I use a very mild expression—of American journalism." Again he says : "The Indian Empire is the regular theme of Anglophobists. They never mention it without giving utterance to burning words about the oppression of the Hindoo." And he concludes : "I have said that there is no pervading antipathy to America in British literature or in the British press. . . . Therefore, whatever warrant or dignity hatred may derive from reciprocation is certainly wanting in this case."

There are proofs without limit of this hostile feeling. The action of both political parties in 1888 showed that both felt the great importance of pandering to this feeling against England.

The *New York Sun's* review of the year 1894 is a striking illustration of the anti-British tone of American journalism referred to by Mr. Smith. The article shows a very unfriendly feeling towards England. The statement is made that in America "the hatred of Great Britain is deep-rooted and unslakable," and expression is given to the following sentiments: "The auspicious and ideal coalition, from the point of view of the American Republic, would be one between Russia, Germany and France, for the partition of the British Empire; nothing could withstand such a coalition, and there would be spoils enough for all; nor is there any doubt that Canada, and probably the British West Indies, would fall to us, in recognition of the undisguised delight with which we should survey the ruin of our hereditary foe."

The extract is very significant, from the fact that the *New York Sun* is the foremost advocate of annexation, and is practically the organ of the Continental Union Association on both sides of the boundary. Mr. C. A. Dana, who is said to be the treasurer of the funds of the American wing of the organization, is the editor of the *Sun*, while Mr. Goldwin Smith, who is the honorary president of the Canadian wing of the organization, is a frequent contributor to its columns.

Mr. Goldwin Smith's suggestions as to how the United States could destroy our railways with dynamite, pointing out as he does what he considers the weak points, are quite unnecessary. He is not known as an authority on the art of war. He asks, "Will the Canadians who have remained at home arm against their kinsmen on the other side of the line? . . . Will the Irish of Montreal and Toronto arm, in a British quarrel, against the Irish of New York and Chicago?"

Our only recent experience on these points was during the Fenian raids of 1866, when not only did Canadians come home from every part of the Union to help in the defence of their native land, but Irish Roman Catholics also in numbers served with their fellow-Canadians in the same cause. There are in the United States about 1,200,000 people who were born in Great Britain. Will it be said that the men of England and Scotland would not arm in defence of Great Britain, in case of war with the United States, because a million of their kinsmen had thrown in their lot with the foreigner? The idea is absurd; and yet

Mr. Goldwin Smith makes that insinuation against the Canadians, whose whole past history is a protest against any such statement.

Admitting that there were only a quarter of a million of people in the North-West in 1894, it is wonderful progress when we remember that the Canadian Pacific Railway, giving convenient access to it, was only opened in the fall of 1885, less than ten years ago. The statement that, as a wheat-growing speculation, the region had failed, is most unfair. Manitoba wheat has no superior, and the crop last year was 17,000,000 bushels.¹ Wheat-growing pays as well in the North-West as in other countries, for the price at present is everywhere depressed.

Mr. Smith also says: "The prediction that the Canadian Pacific Railway would never pay for the grease on its wheels has in fact proved too true." The *New York World Almanac* for 1895 contains the report of the Canadian Pacific for 1893; it is as follows:

Total earnings	\$20,962,317
Operating expenses	13,220,901
<hr/>	
Net earnings	7,741,416
Add interest	209,863
<hr/>	
Total income	\$7,951,279
Fixed charges	5,338,597
<hr/>	
Surplus	\$2,612,682

This last year there has been a very large falling off in the receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway owing to the world-wide commercial depression; but this is likely to be only temporary in its effects.

From the same Almanac we find that in the ten years from 1884 to 1893 inclusive, no less than 309 railroads in the United States, with total stock and bond debts of \$3,-875,581,000, had been foreclosed, or placed in the hands of receivers. These roads have a mileage of 74,312 miles, out of the total for the United States of 175,441 miles.

Mr. Goldwin Smith does not put forward his own opinion on the strength of the annexation party in Canada, but quotes from Max O'Rell, a stranger, who spent a few days or perhaps weeks in the country. Mr. Goldwin Smith, be-

¹ Since this article was written, this year's harvest has produced 30,000,000.

ing honorary president of the Continental Union Club and the principal contributor to its funds on this side of the boundary line, knows that the party, with the single exception of himself, consists of only a few score of dissatisfied, impecunious men, without either reputation or influence.

Canadians are not likely to favour annexation. Their whole traditions, their national spirit, their respect for the dead that have gone before, everything that would appeal to honour or sentiment, forbid such an idea. On material grounds, everything is against it. Our people are a moral, law-abiding people. Compare the criminal statistics, according to the *Chicago Tribune's* returns (the best available), we find that there were 3567 murders in the United States in 1889, 6615 in 1893, and 9800 in 1894. The number lynched in 1894 was 190, of whom four were women; the number legally executed in that year up to October, 112.

The murders per 10,000,000 of population per annum in 1893 were, England 126, Austria 150, France 175, Spain 700, Italy 825, and the United States 1500 in 1894. As the United States statistics are more comprehensive than the European, probably for a comparison, 1200 would be a fairer estimate. In Canada, in the year ending September 30, 1893, twenty-two persons were charged with murder, and thirty-four with manslaughter, or a total of fifty-six for 5,000,000 people, or 112 per 10,000,000 per annum, the best record of them all. Lynching is unknown in Canada. The amount of money stolen by embezzlers and defaulters in the United States in 1894 amounted to \$25,234,112. The widespread distress and depression in the United States, the fact that our share in paying the pension fund of \$140,000,000, would be \$10,000,000 per annum, or more than the interest of our gross debt of \$300,000,000, all tend to show that annexation cannot appeal to the Canadian people on any ground, either moral or material. No wonder Mr. Smith quotes a French traveller as his authority for the extent of the annexation party. And yet his articles are read in England as conveying information on Canadian questions.

Mr. Smith says: "A Canadian politician in England spouts loyalty like a geyser. The same man in Canada is the chief author of a tariff, which has for its main object the capture of protectionist votes by the exclusion of British 'goods.' A more incorrect and wilfully unfair statement

than this, in reference to the Canadian tariff, which resulted from the success of the National Policy in 1878, could hardly be imagined. Mr. Goldwin Smith himself took an active part in that election, in support of Sir John Macdonald and the National Policy. He then for the first time appeared upon the political platform in an election campaign in Canada. After Sir John Macdonald's success and after the tariff legislation had been passed, Mr. Smith endorsed and defended it. In the *Bystander* for January 1880, speaking of the tariff, he says :

"After all, what produced the deficit which these new duties of ours were required to fill? What but Imperial aggrandizement? England chooses to have a railroad to carry her troops from Halifax to Quebec, and she chooses that another line should be run across the Continent, to take in British Columbia, a Province severed from Canada by the most adamant barriers of Nature. The outlay on these objects causes our expenditure to exceed our income, and the taxes thus rendered necessary are imposed by English ambition on itself."

In the *Bystander* for July, 1880, referring again to the National Policy tariff, he says :

"To allow Canada to be made a slaughter market was in any case impolitic and wrong, nor shall we fare the worse in any future negotiation with the United States, because justice has been done by our Government to our own industries in the meantime."

Again in the *Bystander* for January, 1881, he once more defends the tariff :

"But the tariff as a whole has fulfilled the proper purpose of all tariffs. It has raised the requisite amount of revenue. The opposition can assail it successfully only by showing that a revenue sufficient to fill the deficit could have been raised in a better way; and this not one of their speakers or organs, so far as we have seen, has as yet attempted to do."

The above extracts show clearly that Mr. Smith supported the Canadian tariff, defended it for years after it was passed, and understood thoroughly the causes which forced the Canadian people into that line of action. He knows that it was to raise a revenue, and to prevent the United States making Canada a slaughter market for their goods.

To show how friendly to England is this writer, who sneers at our tariff as intended for the exclusion of English

goods, it is only necessary to recall the fact that he was one of the original little knot of agitators, who commenced the Commercial Union movement in 1887, by which English goods would have been taxed about double the present tariff to get into Canada, while the United States goods would have come in free. This was a scheme for the exclusion of British goods for the benefit of the foreigner. It discriminated against England, and the Canadian people would have none of it.

Mr. Smith also says that no one dreams that American invasion could be resisted if it came, and "any force which Great Britain might have in Canada would probably be at once withdrawn. To leave it in face of overpowering odds would be to court loss and dishonour." There is a precedent for this suggestion. A Russian woman once, to save herself, flung her children to the wolves; but her indignant fellow-villagers put her to death. The odds in 1812 were thirty to one against us, and we were successful. To-day they are about twelve to one, not counting Imperial assistance, or practically the same odds that Japan has lately faced against China. This suggestion of Mr. Smith's, that the Englishmen of to-day would abandon their fellow-subjects from craven fear of the odds, gives a vivid indication of his idea of honour; but it is contrary to all British traditions, and is an insult to the race. The same writer, in concluding his article, says:

"The British public, if it wishes to form a safe judgment on this case, must bring itself to believe that an Englishman, heartily loyal to his country, prizing above all things her interest and her honour, as proud as any of her sons can be of her glories in war as well as in peace, and, above all, of her glories in the field of colonization, may, with all the facts daily before his eyes, be sincerely convinced that it will be a happy day for her when she bestows her blessing upon the reunion of her race in America, renews the bond of affection with the whole of it, and, in emancipating a dependency, shows herself indeed to be the mother of free nations."

These are Mr. Smith's views of loyalty to England. The St. George's Society of Toronto, composed of Englishmen, many of them most prominent citizens, "loyal to their country, prizing above all things her interest and her honour," "with all the facts daily before their eyes," expressed

their views, in the largest meeting of the Society ever held, in the following resolution, which was unanimously carried on the 3rd of March, 1893 :

“Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of this Society that Mr. Goldwin Smith, one of its life members, has openly proclaimed himself in favour of severing Canada from the rest of the British Empire, and has also accepted the office of honorary president of an association having for its object the active promotion of an agitation for the union of Canada with the United States : Therefore, this Society desires emphatically to place on record its strong disapprobation of any such movement, and hereby expresses its extreme regret that the Society should contain in its ranks a member who is striving for an object which would cause an irreparable injury to this Dominion, would entail a loss to the Motherland of a most important part of her Empire, and would deprive Canadians of their birthright as British subjects.”

This was followed by Mr. Smith's resignation of membership. If the British public wish “to form a safe judgment on this case,” let them be guided by the above opinion of a large meeting of some hundreds of their loyal fellow-countrymen.

Mr. Smith wishes to deprive England of an immense territory, to cast off 5,000,000 of her loyal fellow-subjects, who have stood by the Empire under every difficulty and every trial, on the same ground that Lord Shelburne made such sacrifices in 1783—viz., “reconciliation.” If Mr. Smith himself believed this would be effective, there might be some excuse for him ; but his own article on “The Hatred of England” shows that he thoroughly understands American hostility, and yet he is willing to deprive England of great moral and material strength, of coaling stations of inestimable value, of fisheries unparalleled, of mineral and agricultural resources almost without limit, in order to build up and strengthen a nation that, as the *New York Sun*, the organ of his cause, says, “would view with undisguised delight the ruin of her hereditary foe.”

In conclusion, permit me, as one of that great mass of the Canadian people whose ancestors fought for a United Empire in 1776, and in the British interests on this Continent in every generation since, to appeal to the British public to stand fast by the Empire built up by our fathers—

to strive to weld it closer and closer together—and to look towards the Colonies in the spirit that was voiced on their behalf by our late Premier at the opening of the Ottawa Conference: “We meet, not to consider the prospects of separation from the Mother Country, but to plight our faith anew to each other, and to plight anew to the Motherland that faith that has never yet been broken or tarnished.”

GEORGE T. DENISON.

